

RANDOM LINEAR COMBINATIONS OF FUNCTIONS FROM L_1

P.G. GRIGORIEV

ABSTRACT. In the paper I study properties of random polynomials with respect to a general system of functions. Some lower bounds for the mathematical expectation of the uniform and recently introduced integral-uniform norms of random polynomials are established.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES: Random polynomial, estimates for maximum of random process, integral-uniform norm.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the article we research random polynomials (linear combinations of functions with random coefficients) of the type

$$F_n(\omega, x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i(\omega) f_i(x), \quad (1)$$

where $\{f_i\}_1^n$ is a system of functions on a measure space (X, μ) and $\{\xi_i\}_i^n$ is a set of independent random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$ ("random coefficients"). Our interest will be concentrated on the properties of the random variable $\|F_n(\omega, \cdot)\|_{B(X)}$, where $\|\cdot\|_B$ is a norm in a certain space B consisting of functions on (X, μ) .

Note, when $B = L_\infty$, the formulated above research topic becomes the classical problem of estimating the expectation of the supremum of random polynomial (1). In 1954 Salem and Zygmund [17] established that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\| \sum_{k=-n}^n r_k(\omega) e^{ikx} \right\|_\infty \equiv \frac{1}{2^{2n+1}} \sum_{\substack{\text{over all choices} \\ \text{of signs: } \varepsilon_k = \pm 1}} \left\| \sum_{k=-n}^n \varepsilon_k e^{ikx} \right\|_\infty \asymp \sqrt{n \log n}, \quad (2)$$

where $r_k(\omega) = \text{sign} \sin(2^{k+1} \pi \omega)$ are the Rademacher functions on $[0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{E}$ denotes the mathematical expectation. However, by the virtue of Khinchin's inequality it follows that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\| \sum_{k=-n}^n r_k(\omega) e^{ikx} \right\|_p \asymp_p \sqrt{n}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty.$$

These facts demonstrate that the embeddings of the spaces of trigonometric polynomials into L_∞ and L_p with $p < \infty$ are qualitatively different.

By now a number of estimates for the uniform norm of random polynomials (1) with various constraints on $\{\xi_i\}_1^n$ and $\{f_i\}_1^n$ have been established. Note while the upper estimates have many important applications in analysis and probability, the applications of the lower estimates are rather rare. Nevertheless, proofs of the lower estimates are more challenging and usually need involving some specific properties of systems $\{f_i\}$ and $\{\xi_i\}$. E.g. the proof of the lower bound in (2) in [17] essentially relied on the facts that the trigonometric functions is a system of *characters* (i.e. formulae like $\cos(\alpha + \beta) = \cos \alpha \cdot \cos \beta - \sin \alpha \cdot \sin \beta$ were used)

This work was supported by grants "Leading Scientific Schools of the Russian Federation" 00-15-96047 and RFFI 02-01-00315.

This paper is to be published in Mathematical Notes (*Matematicheskie zametki*).

and that for distribution of linear combinations of Rademacher functions an exponential estimate holds. In [9] one can find a short proof of a sharp lower estimate for the random polynomial $\sum_k \xi_k \cos kx$, where $\{\xi_k\}$ are independent Gaussian variables, this proof relies on the fact that the matrix $(\cos \frac{2\pi}{n}jk)_{j,k=0}^{n-1}$ is a multiple of an orthogonal matrix and that uncorrelated Gaussian variables are independent. Proofs of the upper estimates normally use a simple averaging argument and need essentially weaker constraints on system $\{f_i\}$. Usually, if an upper estimate for the expectation of a norm of the random polynomial (1) takes place, then essentially the same estimate holds if we substitute in (1) the functions f_i with their absolute values $|f_i|$. In this paper, continuing the work [6], there is established a lower estimate for the uniform norm of random polynomials with respect to an abstract functional system $\{f_i\}_1^n$ from L_1 , provided that the system satisfies a weak condition.

In monographs [13], [14] one can find a deep theory which enables to estimate the expectation of the uniform norm of random polynomials (1), provided $\{f_i\}$ is a system of characters of a locally compact Abelian group restricted to a compact neighborhood V of the group identity element. The basic method for estimating the supremum of a random process in [13], [14] (in particular, of a random polynomial (1)) is reduction of the problem to a problem of estimating the ε -entropy of V with respect to a metric induced by the random process. This method was originally introduced by Dudley [3] and Sudakov [23], [24] and later was developed by Fernique, Marcus, Pisier, Talagrand and others (see [13], [14], [25], [4]). To obtain a lower estimate for the maximum of a random process using this method, one has to apply a variant of Slepian's lemma [19] for Gaussian vectors. This lemma enables one to estimate from below the probability

$$P\left\{\max_{1 \leq k \leq m} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f_i(x_k) \geq \alpha\right\}, \quad \{x_k\}_1^m \text{ is a net in } X,$$

provided that **all** normalized inner products (cosines of angles):

$$\frac{(W_{x_j}, W_{x_k})}{|W_{x_j}| \cdot |W_{x_k}|}, \quad j \neq k, \quad \text{for vectors } W_{x_j} := (f_i(x_j))_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad j = 1, \dots, m$$

are sufficiently small and $\{\xi_i\}$ are independent Gaussian variables. Demonstrating the existence of such a net $\{x_j\}$ is usually a separate non-trivial problem. Moreover, since Slepian's lemma can be applied only to Gaussian vectors there arise some serious difficulties with transfer of the estimates for random polynomials with Gaussian coefficients to the case of non-Gaussian $\{\xi_i\}$.

In 1995 Kashin and Tzafriri [10], [11], [12] introduced another method for obtaining lower estimates of the uniform norm of random polynomials. In particular, in [10] it was shown that the lower estimate in the Salem-Zygmund theorem (2) stays true for random polynomials with respect to an **arbitrary** orthonormal system, provided that the system is uniformly bounded in L_3 . This approach relies on a version of the central limit theorem with an estimate of the error term. To apply this method it is not necessary to estimate **all** angles between the vectors W_{x_j} , instead of that it suffices to demonstrate that cosines of these angles are **small on average**.

In [11] Kashin and Tzafriri defined the following norm

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} := \int_X \dots \int_X \max\{|f(x_1)|, \dots, |f(x_m)|\} d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_m), \quad (3)$$

where f is an integrable function on a measure space (X, μ) , $\mu(X) = 1$. As in author's works [5], [6] let us call it *integral-uniform norm* for this norm. While obtaining the lower estimate for the expectation of the uniform norm of the random polynomial (1) in [10], [12], a similar estimate for the *integral-uniform* norm with parameter $m \asymp n^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ was *de facto*

proved. It is worth mentioning that estimates for the norm $\|f\|_{m,\infty}$ (or rather for the *family* of norms with $m \geq 1$) are self-interesting, since the values of the norms carry quite full information about the distribution of function f : $\lambda_f(t) = \mu\{x \in X : |f(x)| \geq t\}$. Indeed, it is easy to see that

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} = \int_0^\infty (1 - (1 - \lambda_f(t))^m) dt \quad (4)$$

and $\|f\|_1 \equiv \|f\|_{1,\infty} \leq \|f\|_{m,\infty} \leq \|f\|_\infty$, moreover, $\|f\|_{m,\infty} \rightarrow \|f\|_\infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. In Section 2 (Th. 2) it will be shown that

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} \asymp \sup_{\substack{\Delta \subset X \\ \mu\Delta = 1/m}} \left\{ m \int_\Delta |f| d\mu \right\}$$

provided there exists a subset of X of measure $1/m$.

Using a simple modification of the method from [10], [12], the author [6] proved the following

Theorem A. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be systems of functions defined on probability spaces (X, μ) and (Ω, P) respectively, satisfying:*

- (a) $\|f_i\|_2 = 1$ and $\|f_i\|_{2+\varepsilon} \leq M$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ with some constants $M > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$.
- (b) $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i \right\|_2 \leq MR^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |c_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}$ for all sets of coefficients $\{c_i\}_1^n$ with some constants $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, $M > 0$, where $R \equiv R(\{a_i\}_1^n) := \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^4}$ and $\{a_i\}_1^n$ is a **fixed** set of complex coefficients.
- (c) $\{\xi_i\}_1^n$ is a system of independent variables such that $E\xi_i = 0$, $E|\xi_i|^2 = 1$ and $(E|\xi_i|^{2+\varepsilon}) \leq M$

Then there exist positive constants $q = q(p)$, $C_j = C_j(p, M, \varepsilon)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, such that¹

$$P\left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \xi_i(\omega) f_i \right\|_{m,\infty} \leq C_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2 \log P \right)^{1/2} \right\} \leq \frac{C_2}{P^q}, \quad (5)$$

where $P = \min(m, R) + 1$ and $R = R(\{a_i\})$ are defined in condition (b). It obviously implies

$$E \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \xi_i f_i \right\|_{m,\infty} \geq C_3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2 \log P \right)^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

(In the case of small values of m or R the inequality (6) easily follows from Khinchin's and Hölder's inequalities and the trivial estimate: $\|\cdot\|_{m,\infty} \geq \|\cdot\|_1$.)

Theorem A is a simple generalization of the results from [10]–[12], where the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm of random polynomials was estimated. There estimates of type (5), (6) for the uniform norm were proved in the case $p = 0$ and was noted that if $a_i \equiv 1$, these estimates could be generalized for the case $p \in [0, 1/2)$. It was also noted that the established estimates stay true for the integral-uniform norm with parameter $m \asymp R^{1/2}$.

Roughly speaking, Theorem A implies that an estimate of type (6) for a random polynomial (1) does **not** take place only if the system $\{f_i\}$ (of normalized in L_2 functions) is “significantly far” from an orthonormal one (e.g. if the functions of the system converge to a fixed function).

Note when $a_i \equiv 1$ ($R(\{a_i\}) = n$), applying Lemma 1 (see below), one can easily deduce the condition (b) for functions $\{f_i\}$, satisfying $\|f_i\|_2 = 1$, from the condition:

¹It is possible to show that in (5) one can choose the power parameter q arbitrarily from the interval $(0, (1 - 2p)/2)$, in this case the constants C_1, C_2 may depend on the choice of q . One can find a detailed proof of (5) with $q = (1 - 2p)/4$ in [7].

(b') $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i f_i\|_2 \leq Mn^{\frac{1}{2}+\beta}$ for all choices of signs $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$
with some $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, $M > 0$.

In [6] it was also shown that provided $m \leq R$ and some additional constraints on $\{\xi_k\}_1^n$ the lower estimate (6) is sharp in sense of order. It was demonstrated by the following

Theorem B. *Let $\{\xi_k\}_1^n$ be a system of independent variables such that the following exponential estimate holds:*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\left|\sum_{k=1}^n c_k \xi_k\right| > t\left(\sum_{k=1}^n c_k^2\right)^{1/2}\right\} \leq C_4 e^{-t^2 C_5}$$

for all sets of coefficients $\{c_k\}_1^n$ with some constants $C_4, C_5 > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C_6 = C_6(C_4, C_5) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\left\|\sum_{k=1}^n \xi_k f_k\right\|_{m,\infty} \leq C_6 \left\|\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{m,\infty} \cdot \sqrt{1 + \log m}$$

for all systems of functions $\{f_k\}_1^n \subset L_1(X, \mu)$ ($\mu X = 1$) and for all $m \geq 1$.

Note that the condition imposed in Theorem A, which requires the functions $\{f_i\}$ to be *uniformly bounded* in $L_{2+\varepsilon}$, looks rather unnatural since the theorem provides *lower* estimates. Roughly speaking, the reason for necessity of such a condition is that the uniform boundness of system $\{f_i\}$ in $L_{2+\varepsilon}$, along with its orthonormality (or a weaker condition (b') combined with $\|f_i\|_2 = 1$), ensures that the “essential” supports of functions f_i mutually intersect “strongly enough”. To convince that the condition of uniform boundness cannot be simply omitted from Theorem A consider the example of the functional system $f_i := \sqrt{n}\chi_i$ on $[0, 1]$, where χ_i are the indicators of the intervals $(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n})$.

The main target of the article is to generalize Theorem A in the particular case $a_i \equiv 1$ for the random polynomials of type (1) with respect to a system of functions $\{f_i\}_1^n$, $\|f_i\|_1 = 1$, which are not necessarily bounded in L_p , $p > 1$. To avoid extreme functional systems, such as one in the previous paragraph, the conditions (a) and (b') are substituted for

(d) $\|f_i\|_1 = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and
 $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i f_i\|_1 \leq Mn^{\frac{1}{2}+p}$ for all choices of signs $\{\theta_i\}_1^n$, $\theta_i = \pm 1$

with some constants $p \in [0, \frac{1}{12})$, $M > 0$. The main result is the following

Theorem 1. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a system of functions on a probability space (X, μ) which satisfies the condition (d) with $p \in [0, \frac{1}{12})$. Let $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be independent variables defined on another probability space $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$, satisfying $\mathbf{E}\xi_i = 0$, $\mathbf{E}|\xi_i|^2 = 1$ and $\mathbf{E}|\xi_i|^3 \leq M^3$. Then there exist some constants $q' = q'(p) > 0$, $C'_j = C'_j(p, M) > 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, such that whenever $m \leq n$*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\omega \in \Omega : \|F_n(\omega, x)\|_{m,\infty} \leq C'_1 \sqrt{n \cdot (1 + \log m)}\right\} \leq C'_2 m^{-q'} \quad (7)$$

and, consequently,

$$\mathbf{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f_i\right\|_{m,\infty} \geq C'_3 (n \cdot (1 + \log m))^{1/2}, \quad (8)$$

where F_n is a random polynomial defined by (1). (For small m inequality (1) follows from Khinchin's inequality.)

This result provides a new estimate not only for the integral-uniform norm but also for the uniform norm of random polynomials (1):

Corollary 1. *Let functions $\{f_i\}_1^n$ and random variables $\{\xi_i\}_1^n$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1. Then for the uniform norm of the random polynomial (1) the following estimate holds*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\omega \in \Omega : \|F_n(\omega, x)\|_\infty \leq C'_1 \sqrt{n \cdot (1 + \log n)}\right\} \leq C'_2 n^{-q'}.$$

Note that Theorem 1, being stronger than Theorem A in some environments, is weaker than that in the two aspects: first, it cannot be applied to polynomials of type $\sum_k a_k \xi_k(\omega) f_k(x)$ with an arbitrary choice of non-random coefficients $\{a_i\}$; second, it imposes the condition **(d)** with parameter $p < \frac{1}{12}$, while in the corresponding condition for Theorem A (condition **(b)** provided $a_i \equiv 1$ or **(b')**) it suffices to have $p < 1/2$. I think that the constraint $p < \frac{1}{12}$ can be relaxed² (see Conjecture 2 below). In [7] a conjecture about possible generalization of Theorem 1 for the case of polynomials $\sum_k a_k \xi_k f_k$ (with non-trivial a_k) is formulated.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we shall prove several auxiliary results which were explicitly or implicitly used in [10], [12], [6]. We gather these results with the intention of making the method developed in [10], [12], [6] easier to understand, apply and make appropriate alterations, e.g. for generalizing of Theorem A for the case of specific values of the power parameter q (see Footnote 1 and Remark 2 below). In Section 3 we shall prove Theorem 1. In Section 4 Theorem 1 will be applied to give a partial solution for a Functional Analysis problem formulated by Montgomery-Smith and Semenov in [15] and to estimate the Marcinkiewicz norm of random polynomials. In Section 4 we shall also formulate two hypotheses, concerning the potential generalizations of Theorem 1.

I would like to express my special gratitude to B.S. Kashin, whose advisement led me to establish the results of the paper, I thank also E.M. Semenov and A.M. Zubkov for valuable remarks and discussions.

2. AUXILIARY RESULTS

Integral-Uniform Norm. Let us check that the definitions (3) and (4) of the integral-uniform norm are identical. It is well-known that $\|g\|_1 = \int_0^\infty \lambda_g(t) dt$ for every function $g \in L_1(Y, \nu)$, where $\lambda_g(t) := \nu\{y : |g(y)| \geq t\}$ is the distribution of g . Thus, to prove equivalence of (3) and (4) it suffices to notice that the function

$$g(\bar{x}) = \max\{|f(x_1)|, \dots, |f(x_m)|\}, \quad \bar{x} = (x_j)_1^m \in X^m =: Y,$$

has the distribution: $\lambda_g(t) = 1 - (1 - \lambda_f(t))^m$.

By inequality $\max(|a|, |b|) \leq |a| + |b|$ it is easy to see that

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} \leq m\|f\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{n,\infty} \leq \frac{n+1}{m}\|f\|_{m,\infty} \quad \text{for all } f \in L_1(X), \quad m \leq n. \quad (9)$$

For the indicator χ_Δ of a set $\Delta \subset X$ the identity (4) implies $\|\chi_\Delta\|_{m,\infty} = 1 - (1 - |\Delta|)^m$ (here and further we denote $|\Delta| \equiv \mu\Delta$). Thus, if $m \geq c|\Delta|^{-1}$, then $\|\chi_\Delta\|_{m,\infty} \geq C(c)$ with a constant $C(c) > 0$.

²The condition **(d)** with parameter $p = 1/2$ is obviously satisfied for **all** functional systems $\{f_i\}_1^n$, $\|f_i\|_1 = 1$. In particular, it holds for the trivial system $f_i \equiv 1$ for which by Khinchin's inequality the L_∞ -norm of random polynomial with respect to that system is of order $\sqrt{n}$. Thus, it makes sense to think about possible validity of estimates of type (7), (8) only in the case $p < 1/2$.

For an integrable function $f \in L_1$ define the following “relative” norms:

$$\|f\|_m^* := \sup_{\Delta \subset X} \left\{ \frac{1 - (1 - |\Delta|)^m}{|\Delta|} \int_{\Delta} |f| d\mu \right\}; \quad (10)$$

$$\|f\|_m' := \sup_{\substack{\Delta \subset X \\ \mu\Delta = 1/m}} \left\{ m \int_{\Delta} |f| d\mu \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Right side of (11) is well-defined only if there exists an event $e \subset X$ such that $\mu(e) = 1/m$. However, we will use this norm only if $X = [0, 1]$ with standard Lebesgue measure.

The $\|\cdot\|_m^*$ - and $\|\cdot\|_m'$ -norms are equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{m,\infty}$ -norm, this is proved in the following result, which was implicitly established by the author in [6].

Theorem 2. *For all functions $f \in L_1[0, 1]$ the following inequalities take place*

$$(1 - \frac{1}{e})\|f\|_m' \leq \|f\|_m^* \leq \|f\|_{m,\infty} \leq 2\|f\|_m'. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Let us show that $2\|f\|_m' \geq \|f\|_{m,\infty}$. Let $\Delta^* \subset [0, 1]$ satisfy $|\Delta^*| = 1/m$ and

$$m \int_{\Delta^*} |f| = \|f\|_m'.$$

(It is easy to see that such a Δ^* exists though not necessarily unique). We have

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} \leq \|f \cdot \chi_{\Delta^*}\|_{m,\infty} + \|f \cdot (1 - \chi_{\Delta^*})\|_{m,\infty}.$$

By (9) we estimate $\|f \cdot \chi_{\Delta^*}\|_{m,\infty} \leq m \int_{\Delta^*} |f| = \|f\|_m'$. From the extremality of Δ^* we get

$$\|f \cdot (1 - \chi_{\Delta^*})\|_{m,\infty} \leq \|f \cdot (1 - \chi_{\Delta^*})\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{|\Delta^*|} \int_{\Delta^*} |f| = \|f\|_m'.$$

Thus, the inequality $\|f\|_{m,\infty} \leq 2\|f\|_m'$ is proved.

Let us check now that for every $\Delta \subset [0, 1]$ the following inequality holds:

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} \geq \frac{1 - (1 - |\Delta|)^m}{|\Delta|} \int_{\Delta} |f| d\mu. \quad (13)$$

Obviously, it suffices to consider the case when f vanishes outside Δ ($\text{supp}(f) \subset \Delta$). By (4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{k+1,\infty} - \|f\|_{k,\infty} &= \int_0^\infty (1 - (1 - \lambda_f(t))^{k+1}) dt - \int_0^\infty (1 - (1 - \lambda_f(t))^k) dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \lambda_f(t) (1 - \lambda_f(t))^k dt \\ &\geq (1 - |\Delta|)^k \int_0^\infty \lambda_f(t) dt = (1 - |\Delta|)^k \|f\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Summing these inequalities from $k = 1$ to $k = m - 1$, we get

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} - \|f\|_1 \equiv \|f\|_{m,\infty} - \|f\|_{1,\infty} \geq \|f\|_1 \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} (1 - |\Delta|)^k,$$

which implies

$$\|f\|_{m,\infty} \geq \|f\|_1 \frac{1 - (1 - |\Delta|)^m}{|\Delta|}.$$

Now, to prove (13) it remains to notice that $\|f\|_1 = \int_{\Delta} |f|$ (recall $\text{supp} f \subset \Delta$). Therefore, $\|f\|_{m,\infty} \geq \|f\|_m^*$.

The inequality $\|f\|_m^* \geq (1 - e^{-1})\|f\|_m'$ obviously follows from the fact that $(1 - \frac{1}{m})^m < e^{-1}$. The proof of Theorem 2 is completed.

A Fact from Geometry.

Lemma 1. (See Lemma 1 in [6] or Lemma 2.1 in [7]). Let $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a set of vectors in a linear space equipped with a norm $\|\cdot\|$ (or a semi-norm), satisfying $\|w_i\| = 1$ and

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i w_i \right\| \leq c \cdot n^{\frac{1}{2}+\beta} \quad (14)$$

for all choices of signs $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\theta_i = \pm 1$, with some constants $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$, $c > 0$. Then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i w_i \right\| \leq C(c) n^{\frac{1}{4}+\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (14')$$

for all sets of coefficients $\{a_i\}_1^n$. This estimate is sharp, i.e. there exist vectors $\{w_i\}_1^n$, a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and coefficients $\{a_i\}_1^n$ such that (14) takes place, but estimate (14') is sharp in sense of order.

Geometrically Lemma 1 claims that the convex hull of the set $B_\infty^d \cup (n^{1/2+\beta} \cdot B_1^d)$ has the inscribed sphere with radius of order $n^{1/4+\beta/2}$, here B_∞^d denotes d -dimensional cube whose vertices have coordinates ± 1 and $B_1^d := \{(v_k) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_1^d |v_k| \leq 1\}$.

Transfer Lemmas. To prove the main result we need the following lemmas which enable us to transfer one property of the multidimensional normal distribution (Lemma 3) to the case of an abstract multidimensional distribution.

Lemma 2. Let $\Omega_j \subset \Omega$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, be events, satisfying

$$(1 - \kappa) \sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Omega_j \cap \Omega_k) \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Omega_j) \right)^2$$

with some $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{j=1}^m \Omega_j) \geq 1 - \kappa$.

Lemma 3. Let $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be a set of Gaussian variables such that $\mathbb{E}h_j = 0$, $\mathbb{E}h_j^2 = D_j \geq r^2 > 0$, $\mathbb{E}h_j h_k = v_{j,k}$ and each pare (h_j, h_k) , $j \neq k$ has a 2-dimensional normal distribution with density

$$\phi_{0, V_{j,k}}(Y) := \frac{1}{2\pi(\det V_{j,k})^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(Y, V_{j,k}^{-1}Y) \right\}, \quad Y = (y_1, y_2),$$

$$\text{where} \quad V_{j,k} = \begin{pmatrix} D_j & v_{j,k} \\ v_{j,k} & D_k \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is a covariance matrix.}$$

Assume also that there exist some constants $R \geq 1$, $c_0, \delta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m |v_{j,k}| \leq c_0 R^{-\delta} r^2.$$

Then for arbitrary choice of $\alpha < \delta^{1/2}$ there exists an independent of R constant $C_7 = C_7(c_0, \alpha, \delta)$ such that

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k) \leq (1 + C_7 P^{-q_0}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) \right)^2, \quad (15)$$

where $P := \min(R, m) + 1$, $\Psi_j = \Psi_j(\alpha) := \{h_j > \alpha \sqrt{D_j \log P}\}$ and $q_0 = q_0(\alpha, \delta) = \min\left(\frac{1}{3}(\delta - \alpha^2), \frac{3}{2}\alpha^2\right) > 0$.

Lemma 4. Let $(\eta_j)_1^m$ and $(h_j)_1^m$ be random vectors with identical first and second moments:

$$\mathbb{E}\eta_j = \mathbb{E}h_j = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}\eta_j\eta_k = \mathbb{E}h_jh_k = v_{j,k}, \quad D_j \equiv v_{j,j} \geq r^2 > 0.$$

Moreover, let $(h_j)_1^m$ be a Gaussian vector whose covariance matrix satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3 with parameters $r, R, c_0, \delta > 0$. Assume also that there exist some positive constants $\delta_i \leq 1, M_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, and $\alpha < \alpha_0 := (\min(\delta, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3))^{1/2}$ such that

$$|\mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha)) - \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha))| \leq M_1 P^{-\delta_1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n; \quad (16)$$

$$|\mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha) \cap U_k(\alpha)) - \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha) \cap \Psi_k(\alpha))| \leq M_2 P^{-\delta_2}, \quad (j, k) \in \sigma, \quad (17)$$

where $P = \min(R, m) + 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j &= \Psi(\alpha) := \{\omega : h_j(\omega) > \alpha \sqrt{D_j \log P}\}; \\ U_j &= U_j(\alpha) := \{\omega : \eta_j(\omega) > \alpha \sqrt{D_j \log P}\}; \end{aligned}$$

and the index set $\sigma \subset \{(j, k) : j \neq k, 1 \leq j, k \leq m\}$ satisfies $|\sigma| \geq m^2(1 - M_3 P^{-\delta_3})$.

Then there exists a constant $C'_7 = C'_7(\alpha, c_0, \delta, \delta_i, M_i), i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha) \cap U_k(\alpha)) \leq (1 + C'_7 P^{-q'}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha)) \right)^2, \quad (18)$$

where the power parameter $q' = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{3}(\delta - \alpha^2), \frac{3}{2}\alpha^2, \frac{5}{6} \min_{i=1,2,3} (\delta_i - \alpha^2) \right\} > 0$.

Remark on Lemmas 2–4. Lemma 2, being a generalization of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, is a known and important result. One can find similar statements, e.g. in [2], [22], [10]. Lemmas 3 and 4, as far as I am aware of, are formulated for the first time, however the ideas for their proofs have been thoroughly borrowed from [10], [12]. Lemma 4 serves to transfer the estimates of type (15) to the “non-Gaussian case.” Note that the main results of [10], [12], [6] could be easier proved and perceived with the help of Lemmas 2 and 4.

Note also that from Lemmas 2 and 3 one can easily derive for Gaussian random variables $\{h_i\}_1^m$, satisfying the assumption of Lemma 3, the following estimate:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} h_j > \alpha r \sqrt{\log m}\right) \geq 1 - C m^{-q_0} \quad \text{for } m \leq R,$$

where R and r are from the statement of Lemma 3 and α, q_0, C are some positive constants. This fact links Lemma 3 with the results of Slepian [19] and Šidak [20], [21], devoted to estimating the distribution of maximum of Gaussian vectors with a non-trivial covariance matrix.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let χ_j be the indicators of the events $\Omega_j \subset \Omega$ and let $\zeta := \sum_{j=1}^n \chi_j$. Then $\mathbb{E}|\zeta| = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Omega_j)$, $\mathbb{E}|\zeta|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Omega_j \cap \Omega_k)$ and $\text{supp } \zeta = \bigcup_{j=1}^m \Omega_j$. Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$(1 - \kappa)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}|\zeta|^2)^{1/2} \leq \mathbb{E}|\zeta| \leq (\mathbb{E}|\zeta|^2)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^m \Omega_j\right) \right)^{1/2}.$$

This proves Lemma 2.

Proof of Lemma 3. Since the random variables h_j are normal we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi D_j}} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{D_j \log P}}^{\infty} e^{-y^2/(2D_j)} dy = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} e^{-y^2/2} dy. \quad (19)$$

Taking into account that $\int_z^\infty e^{-t^2/2} dt \asymp z^{-1} e^{-z^2/2}$ when $z \geq 1$, we have $C_\alpha^{-1}(\sqrt{\log P})^{-1} P^{-\alpha^2/2} \leq \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) \leq C_\alpha(\sqrt{\log P})^{-1} P^{-\alpha^2/2}$ with a constant C_α depending only on α . Thus

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) \asymp_\alpha \frac{m}{\alpha \sqrt{\log P}} P^{-\alpha^2/2}. \quad (*)$$

Thus, to prove (15) it suffices to check that

$$\sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k) \leq (1 + C'_7 P^{-q_0}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) \right)^2. \quad (15')$$

Define the following index set:

$$\sigma_1 := \left\{ (j, k) : 1 \leq j \neq k \leq m, |v_{j,k}| < \frac{1}{32} r^2 \right\}.$$

Chebyshev's inequality for the set $\sigma_1^c = \{(j, k) : 1 \leq j \neq k \leq m\} \setminus \sigma_1$ implies

$$|\sigma_1^c| \leq \frac{32}{r^2} \sum_{j \neq k} |v_{j,k}| \leq 32c_0 m^2 R^{-\delta}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma_1^c} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k) \leq 32c_0 m^2 R^{-\delta} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j).$$

Thus, taking into account (19), we get

$$\sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma_1^c} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k) \leq 32c_0 m^2 R^{-\delta} \frac{\text{const}}{\alpha \sqrt{\log P}} P^{-\alpha^2/2}.$$

Applying (*), we conclude that

$$\sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma_1^c} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k) \leq K_2 R^{-\delta + \alpha^2} \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) \right)^2 \quad (**)$$

with a constant $K_2(\alpha, c_0) > 0$. Thus, to prove (15') we can neglect the summation over σ_1^c on the left-hand side.

Now, let us estimate the sum

$$\Sigma_1 := \sum_{s=(j,k) \in \sigma_1} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k) = \int_{\alpha \sqrt{D_j \log P}}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{D_k \log P}}^{\infty} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \frac{\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (Y, V_s^{-1} Y) \right\}}{2\pi \sqrt{\det V_s}} dy_1 dy_2.$$

Changing the integration variables $t_1 = \frac{y_1}{\sqrt{D_j}}$, $t_2 = \frac{y_2}{\sqrt{D_k}}$, we get

$$\Sigma_1 = \int_{\alpha \sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \frac{\sqrt{D_j D_k}}{2\pi \sqrt{\det V_s}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} Q(t_1, t_2)} dt_1 dt_2,$$

where $Q(t_1, t_2) := (Y, V_s^{-1} Y)$ is a quadratic form. Evaluating the determinant, we get $\det V_s = D_j D_k - v_s^2$ and

$$V_s^{-1} = \frac{1}{D_j D_k - v_s^2} \begin{pmatrix} D_k & -v_s \\ -v_s & D_j \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, the coefficients of the quadratic form $Q = a_s t_1^2 + a_s t_2^2 - 2b_s t_1 t_2$ are defined by

$$a_s = \frac{D_j D_k}{D_j D_k - v_s^2}; \quad b_s = \frac{v_s \sqrt{D_j D_k}}{D_j D_k - v_s^2}.$$

Notice also that $|v_s| \leq r^2/32$, provided $s \in \sigma_1$. Therefore, taking into account that $D_j \geq r^2$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$a_s - b_s = \frac{\sqrt{D_j D_k}}{\sqrt{D_j D_k} + v_s} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, we can estimate the values of the quadratic form Q as follows:

$$Q(t_1, t_2) = a_s t_1^2 + a_s t_2^2 - 2b_s t_1 t_2 \geq (a_s - b_s)(t_1^2 + t_2^2) \geq \frac{1}{2}(t_1^2 + t_2^2).$$

Now, for arbitrary $L > 1$ we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} J(L) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{L\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \left(\frac{D_j D_k}{D_j D_k - v_s^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}Q(t_1, t_2)} dt_1 dt_2 \\ &\leq \int_{L\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} e^{-\frac{1}{4}(t_1^2 + t_2^2)} dt_1 dt_2 \\ &\asymp_{\alpha} \frac{|\sigma_1|}{L \log P} e^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{4}(L^2+1) \log P} \leq \frac{K_3 m^2}{L \log P} P^{-\frac{\alpha^2(L^2+1)}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K_3 = K_3(\alpha)$ is a constant. Choose $L = 3$ and take into account (*) to get

$$J(3) < K_4 P^{-\frac{3}{2}\alpha^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j) \right)^2 \quad (***)$$

with a constant $K_4 = K_4(\alpha) > 0$.

Notice that

$$\Sigma_1 \leq 2J(3) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{3\alpha\sqrt{\log P}} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{3\alpha\sqrt{\log P}} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \sqrt{a_s} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}Q(t_1, t_2)} dt_1 dt_2.$$

Now, in order to finish the proof of (15) it remains to compare the expression

$$A := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \sqrt{a_s} e^{-\frac{1}{2}Q(t_1, t_2)}$$

with the expression $B := (2\pi)^{-1} |\sigma_1| \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(t_1^2 + t_2^2)\}$ on the square $\alpha\sqrt{\log P} \leq t_1, t_2 \leq 3\alpha\sqrt{\log P}$. In fact, if we show that $A \leq B(1 + K_5 P^{-q_0})$ with a constant $K_5(\alpha, \delta) > 0$, then integrating this inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{3\alpha\sqrt{\log P}} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{3\alpha\sqrt{\log P}} \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \sqrt{a_s} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}Q(t_1, t_2)\right\} dt_1 dt_2 < \\ &< (1 + K_5 P^{-q_0}) \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}^{\infty} \frac{|\sigma_1|}{2\pi} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(t_1^2 + t_2^2)\right\} dt_1 dt_2 \\ &= (1 + K_5 P^{-q_0}) \sum_{s \in \sigma_1} \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j) \cdot \mathbf{P}(\Psi_k). \end{aligned}$$

This inequality combined with (**) and (***) would imply (15) and, thus, prove the lemma.

Split the index set σ_1 into the subsets

$$\sigma_i := \{s \in \sigma_1 : 2^{-i} r^2 \leq |v_s| < 2^{-i+1} r^2\}, \quad i = 6, 7, \dots$$

Clearly, $\sigma_1 = \bigcup_{i \geq 6} \sigma_i$. Chebyshev's inequality for $|\sigma_i|$ implies

$$|\sigma_i| 2^{-i} r^2 \leq \sum_{s \in \sigma_i} |v_s| \leq c_0 r^2 m^2 R^{-\delta}$$

and, consequently,

$$|\sigma_i| \leq \min(m^2, 2^i c_0 m^2 R^{-\delta}).$$

Taking into account that $D_j \geq r^2$ for $s \in \sigma_i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(a_s - 1)(t_1^2 + t_2^2) - 2b_s t_1 t_2| &\leq (|a_s - 1| + |b_s|)(t_1^2 + t_2^2) = \\ &= \frac{|v_s|}{\sqrt{D_j D_k} - |v_s|} (t_1^2 + t_2^2) < 2^{2-i} (t_1^2 + t_2^2) \leq 2^{7-i} \alpha^2 \log P \end{aligned}$$

in the domain $\alpha \sqrt{\log P} \leq t_1, t_2 \leq 3\alpha \sqrt{\log P}$. Moreover, it is easy to see that if $s \in \sigma_i$ and $i \geq 6$, then

$$\sqrt{a_s} = \left(\frac{D_j D_k}{D_j D_k - v_s^2} \right)^{1/2} = \left(1 + \frac{v_s^2}{D_j D_k - v_s^2} \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 + 2^{3-2i}.$$

Gathering all these facts, we get

$$A \leq \frac{B}{|\sigma_1|} S,$$

$$\text{where } S := \sum_{i=6}^{\infty} |\sigma_i| (1 + 2^{3-2i}) e^{\frac{1}{2} 2^{7-i} \alpha^2 \log P} = \sum_{i=6}^{[2q_0 \log_2 P]} + \sum_{i > [2q_0 \log_2 P]}^{\infty} =: S_1 + S_2.$$

Taking into account that $q_0 = \min(\frac{1}{3}(\delta - \alpha^2), \frac{3}{2}\alpha^2)$, we estimate

$$S_1 \leq \sum_{i=6}^{[2q_0 \log_2 P]} 2^i c_0 m^2 R^{-\delta} \cdot (1 + 2^{-9}) P^{\alpha^2} \leq 4c_0 m^2 P^{\alpha^2 + 2q_0} R^{-\delta} \leq K_6 R^{-q_0} |\sigma_1|,$$

where $K_6 = K_6(c_0) > 0$ is a constant.

To estimate S_2 notice that $P^{2^6 \alpha^2 P^{-2q_0}} < (1 + K_7 P^{-q_0})$, where $K_7(\alpha, q_0) > 0$ is a constant. Thus,

$$S_2 \leq \sum_{i > [2q_0 \log_2 P]} |\sigma_i| (1 + 8P^{-4q_0}) (1 + K_7 P^{-q_0}) \leq |\sigma_1| (1 + K_8 P^{-q_0}),$$

where $K_8 = 8 + 9K_7$. Therefore,

$$S \leq (1 + (K_6 + K_8) P^{-q_0}) |\sigma_1|$$

and $A \leq B(1 + K_5 P^{-q_0})$. This completes the proof of the inequality (15) and Lemma 3.

Remark 1. In Lemma 3 the power parameter $q_0(\alpha, \delta)$ is not optimally chosen. It is not difficult to show that the inequality (15) stays true, provided $q_0 = q_0(\alpha, \delta, \varepsilon) = \min\{\frac{1}{2}(\delta - \alpha^2), \frac{3}{2}\alpha^2\} - \varepsilon > 0$ for arbitrarily small ε . (In order to check this it suffices to draw a sharper estimate for the sum S). However, in this case the constant C_7 in the inequality (15) would depend also on $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, somewhat more advanced modification of the proof enables to derive (15) with parameter $q_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta - \alpha^2) - \varepsilon$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Since the random vector $(h_j)_1^m$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3 it follows that the estimate (15) for the events $\{\Psi_j\}_{j=1}^m$ with the power parameter $q_0 = \frac{1}{3}(\delta - \alpha^2)$

holds. Thus, to prove (18) it suffices to show that for arbitrary $\alpha < \alpha_0$ the following inequalities take place:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) \leq (1 + L_1 P^{-q_1}) \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(U_j(\alpha)); \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbf{P}(U_j(\alpha) \cap U_k(\alpha)) \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha) \cap \Psi_k(\alpha)) + \frac{L_2}{P^{q_2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) \right)^2, \quad (21)$$

where the constants $q_1, q_2 \geq q'$ and $L_1, L_2 > 0$ depend only on $\alpha, c_0, \delta, \delta_i, M_i, i = 1, 2, 3$.

Notice that

$$\mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) = \frac{1}{2\pi D_j} \int_{\alpha\sqrt{D_j \log P}}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2D_j}} dy \asymp_{\alpha} \frac{P^{-\alpha^2/2}}{\alpha\sqrt{\log P}}. \quad (22)$$

Thus, for all $\alpha^2 < \delta_1$ we have (see (16))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(U_j(\alpha)) &\asymp_{\alpha} \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)); \\ M_1 P^{-\delta_1} &\leq L_3 P^{-\delta_1 + \alpha^2} \cdot \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with a constant $L_3(\alpha, \delta_1, M_1)$. Taking into account (16), we get the inequality (20) with parameter $q_1 = \delta_1 - \alpha^2$.

In order to prove (21) let us recall that according to the Lemma assumption

$$|\sigma^c| \equiv \text{card}\{(j, k) : j \neq k, (j, k) \notin \sigma\} \leq M_3 m^2 P^{-\delta_3}.$$

Thus, for all $\alpha^2 < \delta_1$ we get (see (23))

$$\sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma^c} \mathbf{P}(U_j \cap U_k) \leq M_3 m^2 P^{-\delta_3} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbf{P}(U_j) \leq L_4 m^2 P^{-\delta_3} \frac{P^{-\alpha^2/2}}{\sqrt{\log P}}$$

with a constant $L_4(\alpha, \delta_1, \delta_3, M_1, M_3)$. Using (22) and (23), for $\alpha^2 < \min\{\delta_1, \delta_3\}$ we get

$$\sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma^c} \mathbf{P}(U_j(\alpha) \cap U_k(\alpha)) \leq L_5 P^{-\delta_3 + \alpha^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) \right)^2.$$

Hence, to prove (21) we can neglect the summation over σ^c on the left-hand side.

Notice, when $\alpha^2 < \delta_1$ the estimate (23) implies

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(U_j(\alpha)) \leq L_5 P^{-1 + \alpha^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) \right)^2$$

with a constant $L_5(\alpha, \delta_1, M_1)$. Therefore, to prove (21) we can also neglect summation over the pares $\{(j, k) : j = k\}$ on the left-hand side.

Now, to prove (21) it remains to notice that the assumption (17) implies

$$\sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma} \mathbf{P}(U_j(\alpha) \cap U_k(\alpha)) \leq \sum_{(j,k) \in \sigma} \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha) \cap \Psi_k(\alpha)) + M_2 m^2 P^{-\delta_2}.$$

Taking into account (22), for $\alpha^2 < \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ we can estimate the error term as follows:

$$M_2 m^2 P^{-\delta_2} \leq L_6 P^{-\frac{5}{6}(\delta_2 - \alpha^2)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha)) \right)^2,$$

where $L_6 = L_6(\alpha, \delta_1, \delta_2, M_1, M_2)$ is a constant. Thus, the inequality (21) is proved with the constants $L_2 = L_4 + L_5 + L_6$ and $q_2 = \min\{\frac{5}{6}(\delta_2 - \alpha^2), \delta_3 - \alpha^2\}$.

The inequalities (20), (21), combined with (15), prove (18) with $q' = \min\{q_0, q_1, q_2\}$, where $q_0 = \min(\frac{1}{3}(\delta - 2\alpha^2), \frac{3}{2}\alpha^2)$ is the power parameter in (15). The proof of Lemma 4 is completed.

Remark 2. A simple modification to the proof of Theorem A in [6], which would involve Lemmas 2–4, enables one to establish the estimate (5) with the power parameter q arbitrarily chosen from $(0, \frac{3}{11}(1 - 2p))$. Moreover, if we took into account Remark 1 and made some simple refinements in Lemmas 3 and 4, then we could prove (5) with the parameter q from the interval $(0, (1 - 2p)/2)$, however in this case the constants C_1, C_2 would depend on q . In [7] one can find a detailed proof of Theorem A for the case $q = (1 - 2p)/4$.

Central Limit Theorem. For the proof of the main result we need to apply a version of 2-dimensional central limit theorem with an estimate of the error term. We shall use in one- and two-dimensional case the following result due to Rotar' [16] (or see Corollary 17.2 in [1]):

Proposition 1. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a set of independent random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$, satisfying $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, then*

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}} |P_N(A) - \Phi_{0,V}(A)| \leq K_1(d) N^{-1/2} m_3 \lambda^{-3/2},$$

where $P_N(A)$ is the probability of the event that $N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ belongs to the set A , $\mathcal{C}$ denotes the class of all Borel convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $K_1(d) < \infty$ is a constant,

$$m_3 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_i|^3,$$

λ is the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $V = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{cov}(X_i)$, $\text{cov}(X_i)$ denotes the covariance matrix of vector X_i , finally, $\Phi_{0,V}$ denotes the Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the density

$$\phi_{0,V}(Y) := (2\pi)^{-d/2} (\det V)^{-1/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (Y, V^{-1}Y) \right\}, \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Theorem 1 is a direct corollary of more general Theorem 1' and Khinchin's inequality.

Theorem 1'. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a system of functions on a probability space (X, μ) , satisfying*

- (d') $\|f_i\|_1 = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$;
 $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i f_i \right\|_1 \leq M n^{\frac{1}{2}+p_1}$ for all choices of signs $\theta_i = \pm 1$;
 $\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |f_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_1 \leq M n^{\frac{1}{2}+p_2}$, where $M, p_1, p_2 \geq 0$ are some constants, satisfying $p_1 + 2p_2 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $p_2 < \frac{1}{12}$.

Let $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a system of independent random variables on another probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, satisfying $\mathbb{E}\xi_i = 0$, $\mathbb{E}|\xi_i|^2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}|\xi_i|^3 \leq M^3$. Then whenever $m \leq n$ for random polynomial (1) the estimates (7) and (8) hold with some constants $q = q(p_1, p_2) > 0$, $C_j = C_j(p_1, p_2, M) > 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. (These constants, of course, are not the same as the constants from the statement of Theorem A.)

To deduce Theorem 1 from Theorem 1' it suffices to notice that validity of condition (d), combined with integrated over $x \in X$ Khinchin's inequality (e.g. see [9]) for the sum $\sum r_i(\omega) f_i(x)$ with fixed x , where r_i are the Rademacher functions, implies

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |f_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_1 \leq \text{const} \cdot \mathbb{E} \int_X \left| \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(\omega) f_i(x) \right| d\mu(x) \leq M'(M) n^{\frac{1}{2}+p}.$$

Thus, if condition **(d)** holds with parameter $p = p_1$, the condition **(d')** holds with $p_2 \leq p_1$ and, consequently, if $p_1 < \frac{1}{12}$, then $p_1 + 2p_2 < 1/2$ automatically.

Theorem 1', like Theorem A, is based on the central limit theorem (Proposition 1), however its proof requires essentially subtler preparatory work. Roughly speaking, the reason for this is that while the basis functions $\{f_i\}$ were supposed to be *uniformly* bounded in $L_{2+\varepsilon}$ it was possible to find a “sufficiently large” set $E \subset X$ such that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)|^3}{(\sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)|^2)^{3/2}} \leq \text{const} \cdot n^{-\epsilon}, \quad x \in E, \quad (24)$$

with some $\epsilon > 0$. This inequality is needed to estimate the error term after the application of the central limit theorem. Such a trick was used to prove (5), (6) in [6] (and before that it had been used in [10], [12] to prove similar estimates for the uniform norm).

However, in the assumptions of Theorem 1' there may be no point $x \in X$ such that (24) holds. As a corresponding example take the functions $f_i := r_i + n^q \chi_i$, where r_i are the Rademacher functions, χ_i are the characteristic functions of the intervals $(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n})$ and $\frac{1}{3} < q < \frac{7}{12}$. (You can normalize f_i in L_1 to make the example more appropriate for Theorem 1'.) For such functions the condition **(d)** holds with $p = \max\{0, q - \frac{1}{2}\} < \frac{1}{12}$, however the inequality (24) fails a.e. on $[0, 1]$. Thus, one cannot directly apply Proposition 1, as well as *the other* versions of the central limit theorem, for the sums $\sum_1^n \xi_i f_i(x)$. Nevertheless, the condition **(d')** reserves a possibility for “sufficiently large” set of points $x \in X$ to pick out “long enough” subsum $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_x} \xi_i f_i(x)$ for which the estimate (24) holds and, consequently, the central limit theorem can be applied. It turns out that the index set $\mathcal{I}_x$ may depend on x , for this reason there arise some difficulties with the transfer of estimates for subsums to the case of original polynomial.

Proof of Theorem 1'. Without loss of generality assume $2 \leq m \leq n^{\varepsilon_1} - 1$ with some fixed $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(p_1, p_2) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, whose value will be explicitly set later. Moreover, since $\|f\|_{m,\infty}$ depends only on the distribution of f (see (4)) and $L_1[0, 1]$ contains equimeasurable copy of vector $(f_j)_1^n$ we can suppose that $X = [0, 1]$ with standard Lebesgue measure. The last means that we can use Theorem 2.

Step 1. For each $x \in X$ define the index set

$$\mathcal{A}(x) \equiv \mathcal{A}_x := \left\{ k : 1 \leq k \leq n, |f_k(x)| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon_1} \sum_{j=1}^n |f_j(x)| \right\}.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality we get $|\mathcal{A}_x^c| \leq n^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon_1}$ and $|\mathcal{A}_x| \geq n - n^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon_1}$. For each $x \in X$ define a smaller index set: $\Lambda(x) \equiv \Lambda_x \subset \mathcal{A}_x$ such that $|\Lambda_x| = n - [n^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon_1}]$ and at every x the set Λ_x indexes the $n - [n^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon_1}]$ least values of $|f_k(x)|$. In order to define the set Λ_x formally and provide it with an additional property that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the set $\{x : k \in \Lambda(x)\}$ is μ -measurable we use the following inductive procedure. Let

$$\begin{aligned} k_1(x) &:= \min \{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} : |f_k(x)| \geq |f_i(x)| \ \forall i = 1, \dots, n\}; \\ \mathcal{K}_1(x) &:= \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $k_l(x), \mathcal{K}_l(x)$ for $l = 1, \dots, j-1$ are defined and set

$$\begin{aligned} k_j(x) &:= \min \{k \in \mathcal{K}_{j-1}(x) : |f_k(x)| \geq |f_i(x)| \ \forall i \in \mathcal{K}_{j-1}(x)\}; \\ \mathcal{K}_j(x) &:= \mathcal{K}_{j-1}(x) \setminus \{k_j(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that the indices $k_j(x)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are measurable functions of x . Set $\Lambda_x := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{K}_{[n^{1/2+2\varepsilon_1}]}(x)$. Clearly, $|\Lambda_x| = n - [n^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon_1}]$, $\Lambda_x \subset \mathcal{A}_x$ and

$$\int_X \sum_{k \in \Lambda_x^c} |f_k(x)| d\mu(x) \leq \int_X \sqrt{|\Lambda_x^c|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} d\mu(x) \leq Mn^{\frac{3}{4}+p_2+\varepsilon_1}.$$

and, consequently,

$$\int_X \sum_{k \in \Lambda_x} |f_k(x)| d\mu(x) \geq n - Mn^{\frac{3}{4}+p_2+\varepsilon_1}.$$

Non-triviality of this estimate will be ensured by the choice of ε_1 , satisfying $\frac{3}{4} + p_2 + \varepsilon_1 < 1$.

Step 2. Set

$$X' := \left\{ x \in X : \sum_{k \in \Lambda_x} |f_k(x)| \geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{k=1}^n |f_k(x)| \right\}$$

and notice that $\int_{X \setminus X'} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_x} |f_k| \leq \frac{1}{3} \int_X \sum_{k=1}^n |f_k| = n/3$. Therefore, for sufficiently large³ $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon_1 + p_2, M)$ we have

$$\int_{X'} \sum_{\Lambda_x} |f_k| \geq n - Mn^{\frac{3}{4}+p_2+\varepsilon_1} - \frac{n}{3} \geq \frac{n}{2}.$$

Hölder's inequality for the function

$$F_2(x) := \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

implies

$$\int_{X'} F_2(x) d\mu(x) \geq \int_{X'} |\Lambda_x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \sum_{k \in \Lambda_x} |f_k| d\mu(x) \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}.$$

Notice, if $x \in X'$ and an index set $I_x \subset \mathcal{A}_x$ satisfies $|I_x| \geq |\Lambda_x|$, then by the definitions of Λ_x and $\mathcal{A}_x$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^3 &\leq \left(\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right) \cdot \max_{k \in I_x} \{|f_k(x)|\} \leq \left(\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right) \cdot n^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon_1} \sum_{k=1}^n |f_k(x)| \\ &\leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon_1} \left(\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right) \cdot 3 \left(\sum_{k \in \Lambda_x} |f_k(x)| \right) \\ &\leq 3n^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon_1} |\Lambda_x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right)^{3/2} \leq 3n^{-\varepsilon_1} \left(\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right)^{3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\frac{\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^3}{\left(\sum_{k \in I_x} |f_k(x)|^2 \right)^{3/2}} \leq 3n^{-\varepsilon_1}. \quad (25)$$

We shall need this inequality to estimate the error term in the central limit theorem.

Step 3. Define the sets

$$E_\ell := \left\{ x \in X' : \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4} 2^{\ell-1} \leq F_2(x) < \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4} 2^\ell \right\}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots$$

³As usual, the case of small n can be dealt by increasing or reducing some constants.

Assuming n sufficiently large to ensure that

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \leq \int_{X'} F_2 \leq Mn^{\frac{1}{2}+p_2},$$

for arbitrary $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ we have

$$\mu\left\{x \in X' : F_2(x) \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4} 2^{n^{\varepsilon_2}}\right\} \leq \frac{4}{\sqrt{n}} 2^{-n^{\varepsilon_2}} \int_{X'} F_2 d\mu < 4Mn^{p_2} 2^{-n^{\varepsilon_2}}. \quad (26)$$

Notice

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \int_{E_\ell} F_2 d\mu = \int_{\{F_2 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4}\} \cap X'} F_2 d\mu \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4}$$

so that at least one of the following cases takes place:

- (i) $\sum_{1 \leq \ell < n^{\varepsilon_2}} \int_{E_\ell} F_2 \geq \sqrt{n}/8;$
- (ii) $\sum_{\ell \geq n^{\varepsilon_2}} \int_{E_\ell} F_2 > \sqrt{n}/8.$

Assume first that (i) holds. Define the following index set

$$\mathcal{L} := \left\{1 \leq \ell < n^{\varepsilon_2} : \int_{E_\ell} F_2 \geq \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon_2}}{16}\right\}$$

and notice that $\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \int_{E_\ell} F_2 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{16}$. Denote

$$\mu_\ell := \mu E_\ell; \quad \rho_\ell := \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4} 2^{\ell-1}.$$

It is easy to see that in the case (i) we have

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{32}; \quad \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon_2}}{32} \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Further, on steps 5–11 we shall deal with the case (i) only. The case (ii) is simpler and we shall consider it on the final step 12.

Step 4. Assume $\mathcal{J}_x \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ is an index set (which may depend on $x \in X$), satisfying $|\mathcal{J}_x| \geq n - n^{\frac{1}{2}+2\epsilon}$ ($\epsilon < 1/4$), and for each k_0 the set $\{x \in X : k_0 \in \mathcal{J}_x\}$ is μ -measurable. Then for an arbitrary set of signs $\theta_k = \pm 1$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_x} \theta_k f_k(x) \right| d\mu(x) &\leq \int_X \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k f_k(x) \right| d\mu(x) + \int_X \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_x^c} \theta_k f_k(x) \right| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq Mn^{\frac{1}{2}+p_1} + \int_X \sqrt{|\mathcal{J}_x^c|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq Mn^{\frac{1}{2}+p_1} + Mn^{\frac{3}{4}+p_2+\epsilon} \leq 2Mn^{\frac{1}{2}+\max\{p_1, p_2+\frac{1}{4}+\epsilon\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 1 for arbitrary coefficients $\{a_k\}_1^n$ we have

$$\int_X \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_x} a_k f_k \right| d\mu(x) \leq Cn^{\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\max\{p_1, p_2+\frac{1}{4}+\epsilon\}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with a constant $C(M) > 0$.

Step 5. Let us choose the constants $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that the following inequalities take place:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3 &\leq \frac{1}{4}(1 - 2p_1 - 4p_2); \\ \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + 2\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3 &\leq \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{1}{12} - p_2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The reasons for such a choice will be clear soon. To be definite we could set

$$2\varepsilon_2 = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} = \varepsilon_3 := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{12} - p_2\right), \frac{1}{8}(1 - 2p_1 - 4p_2) \right\}.$$

The constraints imposed on p_1 and p_2 ensure that $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ and ε_3 are positive.

Consider some $E_\ell, \ell \in \mathcal{L}$. For $\bar{x} = (x_i)_1^m \in (E_\ell)^m$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(x_1, \dots, x_m) &:= \bigcap_{j=1}^m \mathcal{A}_{x_j}; \\ \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_m) &:= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_i(x_j) f_i(x_k) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})| \geq n - mn^{\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon_1} \geq n - n^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\varepsilon_1}$. Using the fact that the set $\mathcal{I}(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and the function $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ are invariant with respect to permutations of the coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\mu_\ell^m} \int_{(E_\ell)^m} \varphi(\bar{x}) d\mu^m(\bar{x}) &= \frac{m(m-1)}{m^2 \mu_\ell^m} \int_{(E_\ell)^m} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_k(x_1) f_k(x_2) \right| d\mu^m(\bar{x}) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu_\ell^m} \int_{(E_\ell)^{m-2}} \left\{ \int_X \int_X \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_k(x_1) f_k(x_2) \right| d\mu(x_1) d\mu(x_2) \right\} d\mu^{m-2}(x_3, \dots, x_m). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the arguments of Step 4 for the set $\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})$ $\forall \varepsilon \in \varepsilon_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \int_X \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_k(x_1) f_k(x_2) \right| d\mu(x_1) d\mu(x_2) &\leq \\ &\leq C n^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \max\{p_1, p_2 + \frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon_1\}} \cdot \int_X \left(\sum_{k=1}^n |f_k(x_1)|^2 \right)^{1/2} d\mu(x_1), \end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies

$$\frac{1}{\mu_\ell^m} \int_{(E_\ell)^m} \varphi(\bar{x}) d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_m) \leq \frac{CM}{\mu_\ell^2} n^{\frac{3}{4} + p_2 + \frac{1}{2} \max\{p_1, p_2 + \frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon_1\}}. \quad (28)$$

We are going to show that there exists a set $G_\ell \subset (E_\ell)^m$ such that $\mu^m G_\ell \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu_\ell^m$ and

$$\varphi(\bar{x}) \leq C_0 \rho_\ell^2 n^{-\varepsilon_3}$$

for all $\bar{x} = (x_i)_1^m \in G_\ell$ with some constants $\varepsilon_3, C_0(p_1, p_2, M) > 0$. Indeed, whenever $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ we have $\mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq 2^{-5} n^{\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_2}$ which, combined with (28), implies

$$\frac{1}{\mu_\ell^m} \int_{(E_\ell)^m} \varphi(\bar{x}) d\mu^m(\bar{x}) \leq CM 2^{10} \rho_\ell^2 n^{2\varepsilon_2 - 1} n^{\frac{3}{4} + p_2 + \frac{1}{2} \max\{p_1, p_2 + \frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon_1\}} \leq CM 2^{10} \rho_\ell^2 n^{-\varepsilon_3},$$

where the constants $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$ chosen positive and satisfying the inequalities (27). Thus, by Chebyshev's inequality for the set

$$G_\ell := \{ \bar{x} \in E_\ell : \varphi(\bar{x}) \leq CM 2^{11} \rho_\ell^2 n^{-\varepsilon_3} \}, \quad \ell \in \mathcal{L},$$

we have $\mu^m G_\ell \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu_\ell^m$.

Step 6. For every $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $(x_j)_1^m \in G_\ell$ define the random vector $\eta = (\eta_j)_1^m$ by

$$\eta_j(\omega) := |\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x_1, \dots, x_m)} \xi_i(\omega) f_i(x_j).$$

We are going to show that

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\eta_j + v_j| \leq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}} \right\} \leq \frac{K_0}{m^q} \quad (29)$$

with some positive constants α , K_0 and q which depend only on p_1 , p_2 , M . Obviously, inequality (29) holds if

$$\min_{\theta_j = \pm 1} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^m \left\{ \theta_j \eta_j \geq \alpha \rho_\ell \left(\frac{\log m}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{K_0}{m^q}$$

(to see that it suffices to take $\theta_j = -\text{sign}(v_j)$). To prove the latter inequality we show that

$$\min_{\theta_j = \pm 1} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^m \left\{ \theta_j \eta_j \geq \alpha \sqrt{d_{j,\ell} \log m} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{K_0}{m^q}, \quad (29')$$

$$\text{where } d_{j,\ell} := D(\eta_j) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} |f_i(x_j)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{i \in \Lambda(x_j)} |f_i(x_j)|^2 \geq \frac{\rho_\ell^2}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}.$$

(While estimating $d_{j,\ell}$ we used the definition of Λ_x and the fact that $|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})| \geq n - m \cdot n^{\frac{1}{2} + 2\varepsilon_1} \geq |\Lambda_x|$.)

For a fixed set of signs $\{\theta_j\}_1^m$ ($\theta_j = \pm 1$) denote

$$U_j = U_j(\alpha) := \{\omega \in \Omega : \theta_j \eta_j \geq \alpha \sqrt{d_{j,\ell} \log m}\};$$

$$v_{j,k} := \frac{\theta_j \theta_k}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_i(x_j) f_i(x_k),$$

and note that by the definition of the set G_ℓ

$$\frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m |v_{j,k}| \leq C_0 \rho_\ell^2 n^{-\varepsilon_3} |\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|^{-1}. \quad (30)$$

In what follows we are going to demonstrate that the random variables η_j are “almost” Gaussian and, moreover, “almost” pairwise Gaussian. Then we apply Lemma 4 (with parameters $R = n$, $P = m$) and establish for the events U_j the following inequality:

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha) \cap U_k(\alpha)) \leq (1 + L_0 m^{-q}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha)) \right)^2 \quad (31)$$

with some constants $L_0(p_1, p_2, M)$, $q(p_1, p_2) > 0$, this inequality with help of Lemma 2 implies (29'). Thus, to prove (29) it suffices to prove (31). Steps 7 and 8 are devoted to the proof of (31).

Step 7. Let $(h_j)_1^m$ denote a Gaussian vector with zero mean and the covariances: $\mathbb{E} h_j h_k = v_{j,k}$ and $\Psi_j = \Psi_j(\alpha) := \{\omega : h_j > \alpha \sqrt{d_{j,\ell} \log m}\}$. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi_j) = (2\pi d_{j,\ell})^{-1/2} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{d_{j,\ell} \log m}}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2d_{j,\ell}}\right) dy.$$

We are going to apply Lemma 4 to the vectors $(\eta_j)_1^m$ and $(h_j)_1^m$. In order to check the conditions (16), (17) we shall use Proposition 1.

Given fixed $\bar{x} = (x_j)_1^m \in G_\ell$ and a set of signs $\{\theta_j\}_1^m$, $\theta_j = \pm 1$, let us apply Proposition 1 to the set of random variables $\{\theta_j f_i(x_j) \xi_i(\omega)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})}$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. Here $N = |\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|$ and

$$m_3 = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} \mathbb{E} |\xi_k|^3 |f_k(x_j)|^3 \leq \frac{M^3}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} |f_k(x_j)|^3$$

$$\lambda = V = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} \mathbb{E} |\xi_k|^2 |f_k(x_j)|^2 = d_{j,\ell}.$$

Taking into account (25), we get

$$|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|^{-1/2} m_3 \lambda^{-3/2} \leq 3M^3 n^{-\varepsilon_1}$$

and, consequently, by Proposition 1 applied for the variable $\theta_j \eta_j$ it follows that

$$|\mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha)) - \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j(\alpha))| \equiv |\mathbb{P}(U_j(\alpha)) - \left(\frac{1}{2\pi d_{j,\ell}}\right)^{1/2} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{d_{j,\ell} \log m}}^{\infty} \exp\left\{\frac{-y^2}{2d_{j,\ell}}\right\} dy|$$

$$\leq 3K_1(1)M^3 n^{-\varepsilon_1}. \quad (32)$$

Step 8. As in the proof of Lemma 3 set

$$\sigma_1 := \{(j, k) : 1 \leq j \neq k \leq m, |v_{j,k}| < \frac{\rho_\ell^2}{8|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}\}.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality it follows that (see (30))

$$|\sigma_1^c| \leq \frac{8|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}{\rho_\ell^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^m |v_{j,k}| \leq 8C_0 m^2 n^{-\varepsilon_3} \leq 8C_0 m^{2-\varepsilon_3/\varepsilon_1}. \quad (33)$$

(We used the assumption that $m \leq n^{\varepsilon_1}$).

To apply Lemma 4 and, thus, to prove (31) it remains to demonstrate that an estimate of type (17) holds for all $(j, k) \in \sigma_1$.

For a fixed pair $s = (j, k) \in \sigma_1$ consider the following set of random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$:

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{\theta_j \xi_i(\omega) f_i(x_j)}{\sqrt{d_{j,\ell}}}, \frac{\theta_k \xi_i(\omega) f_i(x_k)}{\sqrt{d_{k,\ell}}} \right) \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x_1, \dots, x_m)}.$$

Apply Proposition 1 to this set. Here

$$m_3^s = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} \mathbb{E} |\xi_i|^3 \left(\frac{|f_i(x_j)|^2}{d_{j,\ell}} + \frac{|f_i(x_k)|^2}{d_{k,\ell}} \right)^{3/2};$$

$$V^s = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} \frac{|f_i(x_j)|^2}{d_{j,\ell}} & \frac{\theta_j \theta_k}{\sqrt{d_{j,\ell} d_{k,\ell}}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_i(x_j) f_i(x_k) \\ \frac{\theta_j \theta_k}{\sqrt{d_{j,\ell} d_{k,\ell}}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} f_i(x_j) f_i(x_k) & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} \frac{|f_i(x_k)|^2}{d_{k,\ell}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$V^s = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{v_s}{\sqrt{d_{j,\ell} d_{k,\ell}}} \\ \frac{v_s}{\sqrt{d_{j,\ell} d_{k,\ell}}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $s \in \sigma_1$, we can estimate:

$$\det V^s = 1 - \frac{v_s^2}{d_{j,\ell} d_{k,\ell}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{64} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since the matrix V^s is positive definite both its eigenvalues: $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1$ are positive. Therefore, taking into account that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \text{trace } V^s = 2$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \det V^s = \lambda_2 \lambda_1 \leq 2\lambda_1$$

so that $\lambda_1 > 1/4$. Taking into account (25) and the definition of $d_{j,\ell}$, $\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})$, we estimate

$$m_3^s \leq 8M^3 |\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|^{1/2} \cdot 3n^{-\varepsilon_1}.$$

Thus, by Proposition 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{P}(U_j \cap U_k) - \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{\det V^s}} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{d_{j,\ell} \log m}}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha \sqrt{d_{k,\ell} \log m}}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(Y, (V^s)^{-1} Y)} dy_1 dy_2 \right| \equiv \\ & \equiv |\mathbb{P}(U_j \cap U_k) - \mathbb{P}(\Psi_j \cap \Psi_k)| \leq \frac{K_1(2) m_3^s \lambda_1^{-3/2}}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|^{1/2}} < \frac{200M^3 K_1(2)}{n^{\varepsilon_1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Now, equipped with the estimates (32), (33) and (34) we can apply Lemma 4 with parameters $R = n$, $P = m$, $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \varepsilon_1$ and $\delta = \delta_3 = \varepsilon_3/\varepsilon_1$ to derive (31) and, thus, to prove (29) with some⁴ fixed $\alpha > 0$, $q(p_1, p_2) > 0$.

Step 9. The aim of this step is to prove that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^m \left\{ \omega : \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i(\omega) f_i(x_j) \right| \leq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\log m} \right\}\right) \leq K_0 m^{-q} \quad (35)$$

for $(x_j)_1^m \in G_\ell$, $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$. This inequality will easily follow from (29) and the following

Lemma 5. *Let $\eta = (\eta_j)_1^m$ and $\eta^c = (\eta_j^c)_1^m$ be independent random vectors and let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be an open or closed set, satisfying*

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{P}\{\eta + v \in B\} \leq p$$

with some fixed $p \in (0, 1)$. Then $\mathbb{P}\{\eta + \eta^c \in B\} \leq p$.

Proof of Lemma 5. Let $\chi(v, w)$ denote the characteristic function of the set $\{(v, w) : v + w \in B\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2m}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\{\eta + \eta^c \in B\} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \chi(v, w) dF_{\eta|\eta^c}(v|w) dF_{\eta^c}(w),$$

where $F_{\eta|\eta^c}(v|w)$ is the conditional distribution of vector η given η^c (see [18] for the definition), $F_{\eta^c}(w)$ is the distribution of η^c . Since the vectors η and η^c are independent, we have $F_{\eta|\eta^c}(v|w) = F_\eta(v)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\eta + \eta^c \in B\} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \chi(v, w) dF_\eta(v) dF_{\eta^c}(w) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{P}\{\eta \in B - w\} dF_{\eta^c}(w) \leq p \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5 is proved. $\square$

⁴In this work we do not try to choose the power parameter q optimally. However, note if $\alpha^2 = \frac{1}{4}(\frac{1}{12} - p_1)$ than Lemma 4 ensures (31) and (29) with $q = \frac{1}{4}(\frac{1}{12} - p_1)$.

Now, to deduce (35)⁵ from (29) it suffices to notice that the random vectors, defined by

$$\eta_j := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\bar{x})} \xi_i f_i(x_j), \quad \eta_j^c := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f_i(x_j) - \eta_j,$$

are independent and apply Lemma 5 to these vectors with parameter $p = K_0 m^{-q}$ and $B := \{(y_j)_1^m \in \mathbb{R}^m : |y_j| \leq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{|\mathcal{I}(\bar{x})|}}\}$.

Step 10. For $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ set

$$\Omega_\ell := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \mu^m \left\{ \bar{x} \in G_\ell : \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |F_n(\omega, x_j)| \geq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\log m} \right\} \geq \frac{\mu^m G_\ell}{2} \right\}.$$

From (35) it follows that

$$\gamma := \mathbf{P} \times \mu^m \left\{ (\omega, \bar{x}) \in \Omega \times G_\ell : \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |F_n(\omega, x_j)| \geq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\log m} \right\} \geq \left(1 - \frac{K_0}{m^q}\right) \mu^m G_\ell.$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(\Omega_\ell) \mu^m G_\ell + (1 - \mathbf{P}(\Omega_\ell)) \frac{\mu^m G_\ell}{2} \geq \gamma \geq (1 - K_0 m^{-q}) \mu^m G_\ell$$

and, therefore $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_\ell) \geq 1 - 2K_0 m^{-q}$.

We shall need the following

Lemma 6. *Let $T_\ell \geq 0$ be numbers, satisfying $\sum_{\ell=1}^L T_\ell = T$ (L may be infinite), and let Ω_ℓ be events, satisfying $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_\ell) \geq 1 - p$. Then*

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^L T_\ell I_{\Omega_\ell}(\omega) \leq \frac{T}{2} \right\} \leq 2p,$$

where I_{Ω_ℓ} are the indicators of Ω_ℓ .

Proof of Lemma 6. Set $q = \mathbf{P}(\sum_{\ell=1}^L T_\ell I_{\Omega_\ell} \leq \frac{T}{2})$, then

$$q \frac{T}{2} + (1 - q)T \geq \mathbf{E} \sum_{\ell=1}^L T_\ell I_{\Omega_\ell} \geq T(1 - p).$$

Therefore, $q \leq 2p$. Lemma 6 is proved. $\square$

Let us apply Lemma 6 to the numbers $T_\ell := \mu_\ell \rho_\ell$ and the events Ω_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ with the parameter $p = 2K_0 m^{-q}$. We derive that there exists an event Ω_0 and a subset $\mathcal{L}_0(\omega) \subset \mathcal{L}$ such that $\Omega_0 \subset \bigcap_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0} \Omega_\ell$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\Omega_0) \geq 1 - 4K_0 m^{-q}$$

and (see Step 3)

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{64} \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega_0 \quad (36)$$

⁵If we were only interested in estimates for the *uniform* norm of random polynomials (Corollary 1), then practically we could finish the proof on this step. Indeed, inequality (35) with $m = \lceil n^{\varepsilon_1} \rceil$ proves Corollary 1 for the case (i) from Step 3. If the case (ii) takes place, then it suffices to apply Proposition 1 to $\{f_i(x)\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}(x)}$ at a single point $x \in E_\ell$, $\ell > n^{\varepsilon_1}$, and, by Lemma 5, derive the desired estimate with a “great reserve.”

Step 11. For $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ set

$$\Delta_\ell(\omega) := \{x \in E_\ell : |F_n(\omega, x)| \geq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\log m}\}.$$

Almost surely on Ω_ℓ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu E_\ell)^m - (\mu E_\ell - \mu \Delta_\ell)^m &= \mu^m \left\{ \bar{x} \in E_\ell^m : \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |F_n(\omega, x_j)| \geq \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\log m} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{\mu^m G_\ell}{2} \geq \frac{(\mu E_\ell)^m}{4} \equiv \frac{\mu_\ell^m}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $1 \geq \frac{1}{4} + \left(1 - \frac{\mu \Delta_\ell}{\mu_\ell}\right)^m$ and

$$\frac{\mu \Delta_\ell}{\mu_\ell} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{1/m} \geq \frac{1}{4m}.$$

There exist some subsets $\Delta'_\ell(\omega) \subset \Delta_\ell(\omega)$ such that $\mu \Delta'_\ell = \frac{\mu_\ell}{4m}$. Set $E' = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0} \Delta'_\ell(\omega)$, $\mu E' = \frac{1}{4m} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0} \mu_\ell$.

Now, for almost all $\omega \in \Omega_0$ (Ω_0 and $\mathcal{L}_0$ defined on the previous step) by Theorem 2 we can estimate the integral-uniform norm of the random polynomial $F_n(\omega, x)$ of the type (1), using its “relative” norm $\|\cdot\|_m^*$ (see (10)). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_n(\omega, \cdot)\|_m^* &\geq \frac{1}{\mu E'(\omega)} \left(\int_{E'(\omega)} |F_n(\omega, x)| d\mu(x) \right) \left(1 - (1 - \mu E'(\omega))^m \right) \geq \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mu E'(\omega)} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \frac{\mu_\ell}{4m} \alpha \rho_\ell \sqrt{\log m} \right) \left(1 - (1 - \mu E'(\omega))^m \right) = \\ &= \alpha \sqrt{\log m} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \right) \cdot t_0^{-1} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{t_0}{4m}\right)^m \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $t_0 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0} \mu_\ell$. Taking into account (36) and that $1 - (1 - \frac{t}{4m})^m \geq t/8$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ and $m \geq 1$, by Theorem 2 (see (12)) we get

$$\|F_n(\omega, \cdot)\|_{m, \infty} \geq \|F_n(\omega, \cdot)\|_m^* \geq 8^{-3} \alpha \sqrt{n \log m} \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega_0.$$

This, combined with $P(\Omega_0) \geq 1 - 4K_0 m^{-q}$, proves (7) if the case (i) takes place (see Step 3).

Step 12. In order to finish the proof of the theorem, it remains to consider the case (ii) from Step 3. Notice, since the inequality (25) holds a.e. on X' (for $I_x = \mathcal{A}_x$), we can apply Proposition 1 (in the one-dimensional case) for the sum of random variables $\eta_x := |\mathcal{A}_x|^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_x} \xi_i f_i(x)$. We get

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}} P\left\{ |\eta_x + v| \leq \gamma \sqrt{d(x)} \right\} = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{-\gamma}^{\gamma} e^{-y^2/2} dy + O(n^{-\varepsilon_1}),$$

where $d(x) := |\mathcal{A}_x|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_x} |f_i(x)|^2$. Set $\gamma = m^{-\varepsilon_1}$, then for almost all $x \in E_\ell$, $\ell \geq 1$, we get

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}} P\left\{ |\eta_x + v| \leq \sqrt{d(x)} m^{-\varepsilon_1} \right\} \leq K' m^{-\varepsilon_1}$$

with a constant $K'(p_1, p_2, M) > 0$. Taking into account that $|\mathcal{A}_x| d(x) \geq \rho_\ell^2$ for $x \in E_\ell$, by Lemma 5 we get

$$P\left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f_i(x) \right| \leq \rho_\ell m^{-\varepsilon_1} \right\} \leq K' m^{-\varepsilon_1} \quad \text{for all } \ell \geq 1 \text{ a.e. on } E_\ell.$$

For each $\ell \geq n^{\varepsilon_2}$ define the sets:

$$\Omega'_\ell := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \mu \{x \in E_\ell : |F_n(\omega, x)| \geq \rho_\ell m^{-\varepsilon_1}\} \geq \frac{\mu E_\ell}{2} \right\}.$$

As on Step 10, it is easy to prove that there exist events Ω'_0 and an index set $\mathcal{L}_0(\omega) \subset \{\ell : \ell \geq n^{\varepsilon_2}\}$ such that $\Omega'_0 \subset \bigcap_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0} \Omega'_\ell$, $P(\Omega'_0) \geq 1 - 4K'm^{-\varepsilon_1}$ and

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell \geq n^{\varepsilon_2}} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{32} \quad (37)$$

a.s. on Ω'_0 . As on Step 11 set

$$\Delta_\ell(\omega) := \{x \in E_\ell : |F_n(\omega, x)| \geq m^{-\varepsilon_1} \rho_\ell\}, \quad \ell \geq n^{\varepsilon_2}.$$

By definition of Ω'_ℓ we have $\mu \Delta_\ell \geq \mu E_\ell / 2 \equiv \mu_\ell / 2$ a.s. on Ω'_ℓ , so there exist subsets $\Delta'_\ell(\omega) \subset \Delta_\ell(\omega)$ such that $\mu \Delta'_\ell = \mu_\ell / 2$. Set $E' := \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0} \Delta'_\ell(\omega)$. Estimate the $\|\cdot\|_m^*$ -norm of random polynomial (1) (see (10)) a.s. on Ω'_0 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_n(\omega, \cdot)\|_m^* &\geq \frac{1}{\mu E'(\omega)} \left(\int_{E'(\omega)} |F_n(\omega, x)| d\mu(x) \right) \left(1 - (1 - \mu E'(\omega))^m \right) \\ &\geq \frac{2}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \mu_\ell} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \frac{\mu_\ell}{2} \rho_\ell m^{-\varepsilon_1} \right) \left(1 - \left(1 - \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \frac{\mu_\ell}{2} \right)^m \right) \\ &= m^{-\varepsilon_1} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \mu_\ell \rho_\ell \right) \cdot \frac{1 - (1 - t)^m}{2t}, \end{aligned}$$

where $t = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0(\omega)} \mu_\ell / 2 < Mn^{p_2} 2^{-n^{\varepsilon_2}}$ (see (26)). Notice that $(1 - y)^m \leq 1 - \frac{m}{2}y$ for $y \in (0, \frac{1}{m})$, so provided sufficiently large $n > n_0(p_1, p_2, M)$ we have $t^{-1}(1 - (1 - t)^m) > m/2$. Therefore, combining (37) and Theorem 2, we obtain

$$\|F_n(\omega, \cdot)\|_{m, \infty} > 128^{-1} m^{1-\varepsilon_1} \sqrt{n} \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega'_0.$$

The proof of Theorem 1' is completed.

Remark 3. (An analog of a remark from [10]). In the statement of Theorem 1 the condition of uniform boundness of the third moments $E|\xi_i|^3 \leq M^3$ can be relaxed to a weaker condition: $E|\xi_i|^{2+\varepsilon} \leq M$ with some $\varepsilon > 0$. In this case the constants in (7) would depend also on ε . In order to prove such a statement it suffices to apply instead of Proposition 1 with a more precise version of the central limit theorem (Corollary 18.3 in [1]).

4. APPLICATIONS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

Applications of the Integral-Uniform Norm. In [15] Montgomery-Smith and Semenov in connection with their research of strictly singular embeddings of rearrangement invariant spaces in $L_1[0, 1]$ (i.e. the spaces whose norms are invariant with respect to measure invariant changes of variable) put forward a hypothesis which we formulate in somewhat simplified form:

Conjecture 1. *For an arbitrary set of functions $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from $L_1[0, 1]$ such that $\|f_i\|_1 = 1$, there exist a set of signs $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\theta_i = \pm 1$, and a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i f_i \right\|_{2^k}' \equiv \sup_{\substack{\Delta \subset [0, 1] \\ \mu \Delta = 2^{-k}}} \left\{ 2^k \int_{\Delta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i f_i(x) \right| d\mu(x) \right\} \geq c_0 \sqrt{nk} \quad (38)$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ (see (11)).

Using Theorem 1 we can show that the assertion of Conjecture 1 is true, at least if parameter k in (38) varies only in $1, \dots, [\log n]$:

Theorem 3. *For an arbitrary set of functions $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset L_1[0, 1]$ such that $\|f_i\|_1 = 1$, there exist a sequence of signs $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\theta_i = \pm 1$, and a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that (38) holds for all $k = 1, \dots, [\log n]$.*

The proof of Theorem 3 almost coincide with the proof of Theorem 5 in [6]. The only difference is that instead of Theorem A, formulated in the Introduction, we need to apply Theorem 1.

Conjecture 1 in the general form stays open. Note that for $k \asymp n^\sigma$ the inequality (38) cannot be proved by a random signs argument, since in most cases the order of the uniform norm (and, thus the integral-uniform one) of random polynomials (1) is bounded from above by $\sqrt{n \log n}$, e.g. this follows from the Salem-Zygmund estimate (2) (see also Th. B from Introduction and Th. 4.3 in [8]).

Now, let us show that from an estimate of the integral-uniform norm it is possible to get one for the Marcinkiewicz norm. Let $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be an increasing concave function such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(1) = 1$. Then the Marcinkiewicz space is defined as a space of functions on $[0, 1]$, equipped with the norm (e.g. see [15]):

$$\|f\|_{M(\varphi)} := \sup_{0 < t < 1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \right\},$$

where f^* is the *decreasing rearrangement* of f , defined by

$$f^*(s) := \inf \left\{ \tau > 0 : \mu\{x \in [0, 1] : f(x) \geq \tau\} < s \right\}.$$

As a direct corollary of (6) or (8) and the equivalence of the norms $\|\cdot\|'_m$ and $\|\cdot\|_{m, \infty}$ (see Th. 2) one can get an estimate for the Marcinkiewicz norm:

Theorem 4. *Assume that for a random polynomial $F_n(\omega, x)$ of type (1) the estimate (8) takes place for all $m \leq n$. And let $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be an increasing concave function such that $\varphi(0) = 0$, $\varphi(1) = 1$. Then the Marcinkiewicz norm of $F_n(\cdot, x)$ can be estimated as follows:*

$$\mathbb{E}\|F_n(\omega, x)\|_{M(\varphi)} \geq A\sqrt{n} \max_{m=2, \dots, n} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\log m}}{m\varphi(1/m)} \right\}$$

with a constant $A > 0$.

On Possible Generalizations of Theorem 1.

Conjecture 2. *The conclusion of Theorem 1 stays true for random polynomials (1) with respect to functional systems $\{f_i\}_1^n$ which satisfy condition (d) with parameter $p \in [0, 1/2]$ (in Theorem 1 it is assumed that $p < 1/12$).*

A somewhat weaker form of Conjecture 2 could be proved if we could prove a statement of the following type:

Conjecture 3. *For systems of functions $\{f_i\}_1^n$ which satisfy (d) with parameter $p \in [0, 1/2]$ there exist some constants $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $L > 0$ such that*

$$\int_X \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n^{1/2+\varepsilon}} f_k^*(x) d\mu(x) \leq \text{const} \cdot n^{p+L\varepsilon},$$

provided $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, here $f_k^*(x)$ denote the decreasing ordered values $|f_j(x)|$ at a fixed point $x \in X$.

By the assertion of Conjecture 3 one could make some estimates in Step 4 in the proof of Theorem 1' more efficient. It is "optimization" of Step 4 that is most promising for prospective generalizations of Theorem 1 in the direction of Conjecture 2.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.N. Bhattacharya and R. Ranga Rao, *Normal Approximation and Asymptotic Expantions*, J. Wiley, 1976.
- [2] K.L. Chang and P. Erdős, *On the application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma*// Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 1952. v. 72. pp. 179–186.
- [3] R.M. Dudley, *The series of compact subsets of Hilbert space and continuity of Gaussian processes*// J. Funct. Analysis. 1967. v. 1. N. 3. pp. 290–330.
- [4] X. Fernique, *Régularité des trajectoires des foction aléatoires gaussiennes*// Lectures Notes in Mathematics. v. 480. Springer. Berlin. 1975. Heidelberg. pp. 1–96.
- [5] P.G. Grigoriev, *Estimates for norms of random polynomials and their application*// Math. Notes. 2001. v. 69. N 6. pp. 868–872.
- [6] P.G. Grigoriev, *Estimates for norms of random polynomials*// East J. Approx. 2001. v. 7. N. 4. pp. 445–469.
- [7] P.G. Grigoriev, *Random and Special Polynomials with respect to a General System of Functions*. Ph. D. Dissertation (*kandidatskaya*), Steklov Institute of Math., Moscow, 2002, (in Russian).
- [8] J.-P. Kahane, *Some Random Series of Functions*. Heath math. monographs. Lexington, Mass., 1968.
- [9] B.S. Kashin and A.A. Saakyan, *Orthogonal Series*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1989.
- [10] B. Kashin and L. Tzafriri, *Lower estimates for the supremum of some random processes*// East J. Approx. 1995. v. 1. N. 1. pp. 125–139.
- [11] B. Kashin and L. Tzafriri, *Lower estimates for the supremum of some random processes, II*// East J. Approx. 1995. v. 1. N. 3. pp. 373–377.
- [12] B. Kashin and L. Tzafriri, *Lower estimates for the supremum of some random processes, II*. Preprint, MPIM, n. 242 95-85. Max-Plank Institut für Mathematik, Bonn, 1995.
- [13] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand, *Probability in Banach Spaces*. Springer Verlag, 1991.
- [14] M. Marcus and G. Pisier, *Random Fourier Series with Applications to Harmonic Analysis*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1981.
- [15] S. Montgomery-Smith and E.M. Semenov, *Embeddings of rearrangement invariant spaces that are not strictly singular*// Positivity. 2000. v. 4. pp. 397–402.
- [16] V.I. Rotar', *Nonuniform estimate of the rate of convergence in multidimensional central limit theorem*// Theory of Probab. and Appl. 1970. v. 15. pp. 647–665.
- [17] R. Salem and A. Zygmund, *Some properties of trigonometric series whose terms have random signs*// Acta Math. 1954. v. 91. pp. 245–301.
- [18] A.N. Shiryaev, *Probability*. Springer Verlag, 1996.
- [19] D. Slepian, *The one-sided barrier problem for Gaussian noise*// Bell. System Tech. J. 1962. v. 41. pp. 463–501.
- [20] Z. Šidak, *Rectangular confidence regions for the means of multivariate normal distributions*// J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 1967. v. 62. N. 318. pp. 626–633.
- [21] Z. Šidak., *On multivariate normal probabilities of rectangles*// Ann. Math. Statist. 1968. v. 39. pp. 1425–1434.
- [22] V.G. Sprindzhuk, *Metric Theory of Diophant Approximations*, Moscow. Nauka, 1977, (in Russian).
- [23] V.N. Sudakov, *Gaussian measures, Cauchy measures and ε -entropy*// Soviet Math. Dokl. 1969. v. 10. pp. 310–313.
- [24] V.N. Sudakov, *Gaussian processes and measures of solid angles in Hilbert space*// Soviet Math. Dokl. 1971. v. 12. pp. 412–415.
- [25] V.N. Sudakov, *Geometrical Problems in the Theory of Infinite-Dimensional Probability Distributions*// Trudy MIAN. 1976. v. 141. (in Russian). English transl. in Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., 1979. 2.